

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 were pending as of the action mailed on March 26, 2007.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 13, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 25 are being amended. Claims 8 and 23 are being cancelled. No new matter has been added.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the action are requested in light of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Section 112 Rejections

Claims 1-16, 21, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite. Claims 1, 21 and 22 have been amended to remove the word 'can'. The applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 1-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by US 2004/0226003 ("Bates").

Claim 1

Claim 1, as amended, recites that each checkpoint in the plurality of checkpoints is defined by statements in source code of a first computer program, where the first computer program is the program which the checkpoints concern. Claim 1 further recites that the assignment of each checkpoint to a checkpoint group is specified in the statement defining the respective checkpoint in the source code of the first computer program

Bates does not disclose this feature. Instead, Bates discloses that a program, its statement list (source code), its breakpoint groups and presumably its breakpoints are all defined separately from the statement list (see FIG. 1, box 115). In fact, the statement list used by Bates to illustrate breakpoint grouping does not include any statements defining breakpoints or breakpoint groups (see FIG. 2, statement list 210). Bates does not disclose or suggest that a plurality of checkpoints are defined by statements in the source code of the program, as recited in claim 1. Moreover

Bates does not disclose or suggest that the assignment of each checkpoint to a checkpoint group is specified in the statement defining the respective checkpoint, as recited in claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons the applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 and claims 2-7, 9-12 and 21, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance.

In addition, independent claims 13, 17 and 25 include limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly the applicant submits that claims 13, 17 and 25, as well as their respective dependent claims, are in condition for allowance.

Claim 6

Claim 6, as amended, recites that activating is to be performed only for a particular user of multiple users using the first computer program, the activating not affecting the use of the first computer program by all other users.

The examiner rejected claim 6 stating "see for example page 4, [0046], 'user')". The applicant disagrees. The cited portion of Bates reads as follows:

[0046] The dialog 256 includes a breakpoint group name field 258 and a condition field 260. In the example shown, the user has entered "on error" in the breakpoint group name field 258 as the name of the breakpoint group to be created. The user has also entered "B==2" as the condition in the condition field 260. Thus, the user is requesting the debug controller 126 to create a breakpoint group named "on error" that includes breakpoints at all statements that are executed only if the condition B==2 is true, i.e., if the statement is executed, then the condition have been true. In the program listed in the program listing panel 210, B==2 must be true in order for the statements 223, 224, and 225 to be executed, so the debug controller 126 adds breakpoints for statements 223, 224, and 225 (if breakpoints for the statements exist) to the group "on error" in response to the input for the dialog 256, as further described below with reference to FIGS. 3 and 4.

In the above cited portion of Bates the 'user' is clearly the agent providing information about breakpoint groups (e.g., the name field and condition field). It is plainly evident that Bates' user is the user of Bates' debugging tool. There is no indication that the user is one among multiple users of the running program that is being debugged. Bates does not disclose that multiple users may use the program or that for some users breakpoints are activated while other users using the same program are unaffected by the activation of the checkpoints.

For these reasons and for the reasons set forth in reference to claim 1, from which claim 6 depends, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 6 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 7

Claim 7, as amended, recites that activating is to be performed only for a particular server of multiple servers on which the first computer program is running.

In rejecting claim 7, the examiner cites FIG. 1, item 105 and related text of Bates. This item shows a circle representing a network. Not surprisingly the text related to item 105 describes a network or a combination of networks. However, the cited portion of Bates does not disclose or suggest multiple servers and does not suggest running the program to be debugged on multiple servers. More importantly, Bates does not disclose or suggest that checkpoints can be activated only for particular servers of the multiple servers on which the program is running, as recited in claim 7.

For these reasons and for the reasons set forth in reference to claim 1, from which claim 7 depends, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 7 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 10

Claim 10, as amended, recites that assertion statements have an argument to activate logging with programmer controlled granularity, the argument being used to determine whether to update a log entry when the assertion statement fails.

In rejecting claim 10, the examiner cites page 4, paragraph 46 of Bates (quoted above). Logging is the practice of recording events as the events occur, typically for the purposes of tracing, auditing and diagnosing execution of programs. The cited portions of Bates do not disclose or suggest logging and do not disclose or suggest that assertion statements have an argument to activate logging with programming controlled granularity where the argument is used to determine whether to update a log entry when the assertion statement fails.

For these reasons and for the reasons set forth in reference to claim 1, from which claim 10 depends, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 17

Claim 17 includes features of claim 1 and also includes features of claim 23. In particular, as amended, claim 17 recites that the assignment of each checkpoint to a checkpoint group is specified in the statement in source code of the computer program that defines the respective checkpoint where the statement includes the group identifier of the checkpoint group.

In rejecting claim 23, the examiner states that FIG. 2, item 258 and related text disclose these features. The applicant disagrees. Item 258 of Bates is a group name field (see page 4, par. 46, lines 1-2). This item is used to receive user input specifying a group name. Thus, Bates only discloses that a group of breakpoints can be named with a group name. Bates does not indicate that a statement in the source code of the computer program specifies a group identifier. This is evident from the statement list 210 in Bates which does not include any statements specifying checkpoints, checkpoint groups or group identifiers. Bates does not disclose or suggest that when a checkpoint is assigned to a checkpoint group, then the statement in the source code that defines the checkpoint also includes the checkpoint group using the group identifier of the checkpoint group.

For these reasons, and the reasons set forth above in reference to claim 1, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 19

In rejecting claim 19, the examiner states, "see for example FIG. 12A, step 1206 and related text". The applicant notes that Bates includes only nine figures. No FIG. 12A or step 1206 is provided or described in Bates.

Claim 19 includes features of claim 7. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth in reference to claim 7, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 19 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 26

Claim 26 recites “adding the plurality of checkpoints to the source code of the computer program, the respective group name for each checkpoint being included in the source code for the checkpoint.”

The examiner rejected claim 26 for the same reasons as claim 23. As set forth in reference to claim 17, Bates only discloses that a group of breakpoints can be named with a group name. Bates does not disclose or suggest that the respective group name for each checkpoint is included in the source code. For these reasons, and the reasons set forth in reference to claim 1, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 26 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 27

Claim 27 recites that the argument to activate logging indicates that a log entry is made for each distinct value of a named field.

In rejecting claim 27, the examiner cites FIG. 5, item 506, “GROUP CREATION MENU” of Bates. As set forth in claim 10, the cited portions of Bates do not disclose or suggest logging at all. In particular, item 506 is a user interface element that includes a list of options for a user to select from. This user interface element is used to determine the parts of a program from which breakpoints are to be added to a breakpoint group (see page 5, par. 62 and 63). For example, Bates discloses that the option 564, “ALL METHODS”, can be selected to cause “the debug controller 126 to add all those breakpoints to the breakpoint group 130 that are in the selected method and all methods that override the selected method” (page 5, par65). Thus item 506 is used by a user to add breakpoints to breakpoint groups. The item 506 has nothing to do whatsoever with logging. None of the cited portions of Bates disclose or even suggest that an argument used to activate logging indicates that a log entry is made for each distinct value of a named field, as recited in claim 27.

For these reasons, and the reasons set forth in reference to claim 1, the applicant submits that claim 27 is in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant's selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant's decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

29 May 07



Hans R. Troesch
Reg. No. 36,950

Customer No.: 32864
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071